

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 3, 2005. Claims 24, 26, 30, 31 to 33, 39 to 41, 51, 53 and 57 to 59 are pending in the application, of which Claims 24, 31 to 33, 40, 41, 51, 58 and 59 are independent.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during a telephonic interview. In that interview the Examiner requested that the terms "irrespective of a printing process" and the term "discriminated" should be clarified in the claims. With regard to the term "irrespective of a printing apparatus", Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite "irrespective of a timing for executing a printing process". With regard to the term "discriminated", Applicant has amended the claims to recite a selection of a deletion combination of any one of a plurality of printing apparatuses and a font name, based on font registration information. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments address the Examiner's concerns. However, no other agreement was reached regarding the claims during the telephonic interview.

Claims 24, 26, 30 to 33, 40, 41, 51, 53 and 57 to 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,732,197 (Nakagiri). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 24 is directed to a host computer that communicates with a plurality of printing apparatuses via a network. The host computer includes a reference unit adapted to refer to font registration information that includes information specifying at least one font registered in each of the plurality of printing apparatuses; a font registration unit adapted to download font data by a font name unit to any one

of the plurality of printing apparatuses for registration; a management unit adapted to retain the font registration information irrespective of a timing for executing a printing process, indicating the font name unit font data downloaded to each of the plurality of printing apparatuses by said font registration unit; a selection unit adapted to select a deletion combination of any one of the plurality of printing apparatuses and a font name, based on the font registration information referred to by the reference unit; and an instruction unit adapted to issue a delete instruction to any one of the plurality of printing apparatuses to delete the font name unit font data.

In contrast, Nakagiri, discloses that, when executing a printing process, a host computer selects a character set (S2-5), discriminates whether the selected character has been registered in the printer (S2-6), and then registers the character set in the printer if it has not been registered (S2-9). If the printer memory is insufficient for registration (S2-7, NO), another registered character set is deleted to register the selected character set (S2-8).

What is taught in Nakagiri is to provide the printer with fonts required for printing, when printing is executed. Nakagiri, therefore, fails to disclose at least some of the features of the host computer of Claim 24. Claim 24 features managing font data by a font name unit for a plurality of printers, as shown in Figs. 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9. Nakagiri fails to disclose the reference unit, which refers to font registration information that includes information specifying at least one font registered in each printing apparatus, the management unit, which retains the font registration information irrespective of a timing for executing a printing process, indicating the downloaded font data, the selection unit, which selects a deletion combination of any one printing apparatus and a font name, based on the font registration information, and an instruction unit, which issues a delete instruction to any one printing apparatus to delete the font data in accordance with the selected deletion combination.

In light of the deficiencies of Nakagiri as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 24 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Independent Claims 33 and 51 are method and computer program claims respectively corresponding to host computer Claim 24, and are believed to be allowable over Hiraike '718 and Hiraike '693 for reasons substantially similar as discussed above in connection with Claim 24. Additionally, independent Claims 31, 32, 40, 41, 58, and 59 include features substantially along the lines as those discussed above in connection with Claim 24. Accordingly, Claims 31, 32, 40, 41, 58, and 59 are believed to be allowable for reasons substantially similar as those discussed above in connection with Claim 24.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the allowability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 109858v1